UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/081,486	02/20/2002	Tatsundo Aoshima	16869N-044000US	1487

20350   7590   09/08/2005

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER
FIELDS, COURTNEY D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2137	

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/081,486	AOSHIMA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Courtney D. Fields	2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 February 2002*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-5* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-5* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

      1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date *20 February 2002*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-5 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

2.   The Information Disclosure Statement respectfully submitted on 20 February

2002 has been considered by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kung

(US Patent No. 5,241,594) in view of Lamport "Password Authentication with Insecure

Communication". As per claim 1, Kung discloses a computer system having a business

system, a commercial service system, and a terminal, comprising:

a terminal that sends a request for the use of the commercial service system to

the business system when a user who logs in the business system uses the commercial

service system (See Column 4, lines 49-66)

a business system that receives the request of use, checks a commercial service

use authority of the user, selects a password prior to authentication, and returns it to the

terminal (See Column 4, lines 32-37, 40-45, 66-68)

wherein the terminal sends the returned password to the commercial service

system (See Column 4, lines 66-68, Column 5, lines 1-37)

and the commercial service system compares the password with accounting information created prior to the authentication permits login when they match, and nullifies the used password (See Column 5, lines 38-53, Column 6, lines 3-19)

However, Kung fails to disclose a password list created using a random number. Lamport discloses a password list stored within the business system by using random numbers to encode the password. (See pages 770-771) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Kung's one-time logon means for distributing computing system with Lamport's one-way function to encode passwords for multiple users. Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since, a need exists for a secure method of communication between business and service systems in which reduces traffic within the network.

As per claim 2, Kung as modified discloses the claimed limitation wherein the business system generates the password list using a random number, sends the password list to the commercial service system, and creates accounting information (See Lamport, pages 770-771)

As per claim 3, Kung as modified discloses the claimed limitation wherein the commercial service system generates the accounting information using a random number, sends the accounting information to the business system and creates the password list (See Lamport, pages 770-771)

As per claim 4, Kung as modified discloses the claimed limitation wherein the business system comprises:

a means for generating the password list using a value to which an optional numerical value and a one-way function were applied sequentially, sending the applicable number of a sequentially applied final result to the commercial service system, and creating the accounting information (See Lamport, page 770)

and a means for returning a password and the applicable number of times of the one-way function to the terminal when use of a commercial service system is requested from the terminal, comparing a result in which the one function was applied to the password sent from the terminal only for a part in which the applicable number of times of the one-way function for the password was subtracted from the applicable number of times of the final result, with the numerical value of the final result in the accounting information when login permission in the commercial service system is decided and permitting the login if they match (See Lamport, page 771)

As per claim 5, Kung as modified discloses the claimed limitation wherein the commercial service system comprises:

a means for retaining the numerical value of the sequentially applied result when the login permission in the commercial service system is decided and applying it to the result in which the numerical value was retained only for the part in which the applicable number of times of the one-way function of the retained result was subtracted from the applicable number of times of the one-way function of a deciding password (See Lamport, page 771-772)

Conclusion

5.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure. Bisbee et al. (Pub No. 2002/0184217) discloses a system and

method for providing user logon and state-less authentication.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Courtney D. Fields whose telephone number is 571-

272-3871. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs. 6:00 - 4:00 pm; off

every Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on 571-272-3865. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

cdf
September 5, 2005

MATTHEW SMITHERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Art Unit 2137